

## REMARKS

### Interview

Applicants below-signed representative would like to thank Examiner Dote for the courtesies extended to him and Mr. Meade during the Interview on September 5, 2007.

As discussed during the Interview, Applicants have chosen to amend their claims in order to define over the cited reference, Asano. A more detailed discussion follows.

### Claims Status

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13-15 and 18-20 are pending in this Application. Claim 1 has been amended to add the dependent claims of 3, 5, 8, 11, 16 and 17 and these dependent claims have been canceled herein.

Claims 6, 9 and 10 have been amended herein because of the amendments made to Claim 1.

Claim 20 is a newly presented claim which is probably best supported by Figure 2 which illustrates the rubber blade touching the photoreceptor.

Thus, no new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

#### Prior Art Rejection

The Examiner has put forward four Prior Art rejections, namely:

- (1) Claims 1, 5-9, 13-15, 18 and 19 unpatentable over a combination of Asano and Uchida;
- (2) Claim 10 unpatentable over a combination of Asano and Uchida;
- (3) Claims 3, 16 and 17 unpatentable over a combination of Asano, Uchida and Hagi; and
- (4) Claim 11 unpatentable over a combination of Asano, Uchida and JP '417.

In light of the addition of the limitations of Claim 11 to Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the first three Prior Art rejections, 1-3 above, have been overcome. With the amendment to add Claims 3, 16 and 17 to Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the fourth rejection outlined above

is overcome. Since no claim had previously been presented which contained all of the limitations which are now in Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments, as presented herein, have now successfully been overcome by way of amending the claims to define over the combined references taken alone or in combination.

#### Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner put forward three double patenting rejections, namely,

- (1) Claims 1, 5, 6, 13-15, 18 and 19 provisionally rejected under obviousness-type double patenting based on Claims 1-3 and 27 of copending Application 10/952,128 in view of Nagase;
- (2) Claims 3, 16 and 17 provisionally rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1-3 and 27 of Application '128 in view of Nagase and Hagi; and
- (3) Claims 6-11 provisionally rejected on grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting based on Application '128 in view of Nagase and JP '417.

In light of amending Claim 1 to add the limitations of Claim 11, it is respectfully submitted that double patenting rejection based on items (1) and (2) above have now been overcome. It is further submitted that in light of the addition of limitation of Claims 3, 16 and 17 to Claim 1 that the double patenting rejection in item (3) above is now overcome. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments made to Claim 1 herein overcome each of the double patenting rejections presented herein.

Request for One Month Extension of Time

A one month extension of time is hereby requested. The appropriate government fee is being paid concurrent with the filing of this Response.

Should any further fees or extensions of time be necessary in order to maintain this Application in pending condition, appropriate requests are hereby made and authorization is given to Debit Account #02-2275.

Request for Reconsideration and Conclusion

In view of the foregoing and the enclosed, it is respectfully submitted that the Application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

By: Donald C. Lucas  
Donald C. Lucas, 31,275  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
475 Park Avenue South, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10016  
Tel. # 212-661-8000

DCL/mr